arXiv:1204.2998v1 [quant-ph] 13 Apr 2012

Reaching Fleming's discrimination bound

G Grübl and L Ostermann

Institut für Theoretische Physik der Universität Innsbruck
Technikerstraße 25, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria

E-mail: gebhard.gruebl@uibk.ac.at, laurin.ostermann@uibk.ac.at

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ta, 03.65.Wj, 03.67.Hk

Abstract. Any rule for identifying a quantum system's state within a set of two non-orthogonal pure states by a single measurement is flawed. It has a non-zero probability of either yielding the wrong result or leaving the query undecided. This also holds if the measurement of an observable A is repeated on a finite sample of n state copies. We formulate a state identification rule for such a sample. This rule's probability of giving the wrong result turns out to be bounded from above by $1/n\delta_A^2$ with $\delta_A = |\langle A\rangle_1 - \langle A\rangle_2| \,/\, (\Delta_1 A + \Delta_2 A)$. A larger δ_A results in a smaller upper bound. Yet, according to Fleming, δ_A cannot exceed $\tan\theta$ with $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$ being the angle between the pure states under consideration. We demonstrate that there exist observables A which reach the bound $\tan\theta$ and we determine all of them.

1. Introduction

The transmission of a binary sequence through a sequence of quantum systems whose states are to be chosen from a given set $\{\rho_1, \rho_2\}$ makes it necessary for the recipient to identify the states ρ_1 and ρ_2 with as little an error as possible. If each single bit is transmitted as a single system, an error minimizing strategy is needed in order to identify this system's state from one single measurement.

If it is to be discriminated between two non-orthogonal states ρ_1 and ρ_2 through the measurement of an observable a certain *positive lower bound* for the probability of either wrong or inconclusive state identification cannot be underrun. Such limitations of individual state identification have been investigated extensively in theory and experiment. For a review see e.g. [1].

If in contrast each bit is transmitted as a sample of n identical systems, all of them in the same state $\rho \in \{\rho_1, \rho_2\}$, the minimum error in reading the message correctly reduces beyond the limit established for $n = 1$. More generally, the sequence of values, obtained by measuring an arbitrary, perhaps non-optimal observable A on each of the sample's members, can be used to lower the probability of an erroneous state identification below the one obtained for a single measurement of A.

We will describe a rule of state identification from the mean value of a general observable A in an n-sample. For this rule we derive an *upper bound* for the probability

of error from Chebyshev's inequality associated with the mean value of A. It turns out that our rule of state identification produces the wrong result with a probability not greater than $1/n\delta_A^2$. Here the dimensionless parameter $\delta_A > 0$ not only depends on the two states ρ_1, ρ_2 but also on the observable A to be measured on the sample's elements.‡ It is given by§

$$\delta_A = \frac{\left| \langle A \rangle_{\rho_1} - \langle A \rangle_{\rho_2} \right|}{\Delta_{\rho_1} A + \Delta_{\rho_2} A}. \tag{1}$$

This number therefore quantifies how well the states ρ_1 and ρ_2 can be distinguished from each other by means of measuring the observable A.

We will address the issue of which observable A, for given states ρ_1, ρ_2, leads to the largest possible value of δ_A. Such a choice then minimizes the upper bound $1/n\delta_A^2$ of the probability of error for a given sample size n, yet it does not need to minimize the actual error itself. For arbitrary *pure* states ρ_1 and ρ_2 we find the maximum of δ_A over the set of all linear, bounded and self-adjoint operators A. We prove that

$$\max_A \delta_A = \tan\theta, \tag{2}$$

where θ with $0 < \theta < \pi/2$ denotes the angle between the states ρ_1 and ρ_2.‖ Furthermore, among all bounded observables A we explicitly specify those which maximize δ_A.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In section 2 we summarize some results concerning optimal state discrimination for single systems and exhibit their relation to our minimization problem. In section 3 we derive the law of large numbers which motivates our quest for maximizing δ_A. In section 4 we slightly adapt Fleming's derivation of the estimate $\delta_A \leq \tan\theta$ to our goals. This proof will then be used first in section 5 to demonstrate that the upper bound $\tan\theta$ can be attained and afterwards in section 6 to identfy those observables A which actually reach this bound.

2. State identification for a single system

How is the state ρ of a single quantum system to be identified within a given set $\{\rho_1, \rho_2\}$ of two different yet non-orthogonal pure states ρ_1 and ρ_2? Is there an observable A which when measured upon ρ allows for identifying the state as either ρ_1 or ρ_2 most 'reliably'?

One way to render this question more precisely has been specified by Jaeger and Shimony. [2] It meanwhile bears the title *'minimum error state discrimination'*. [3] Assume that the spectrum of the observable A consists of two eigenvalues a_1, a_2 only. If the system, whose state is to be identified, is in the state ρ_i with probability p_i, then a measurement of a fixed observable A upon a randomly chosen state yields a random

‡ Since we will vary A and keep the states fixed we refrain from using the more suggestive but cumbersome notation $\delta_A(\rho_1, \rho_2)$.

§ The notation seems obvious and it is spelled out in sect. 2.

‖ This means that $\mathrm{tr}(\rho_1\rho_2) = \cos^2\theta$ holds.

trial with the composite event space $\Omega^A = \{\rho_1, \rho_2\} \times \{a_1, a_2\}$ and with the probability measure W^A whose distribution function p^A obeys

$$p^A(\rho_i, a_j) = p_i \cdot \mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_i P^A_{a_j}\right). \tag{3}$$

Here P^A_a denotes the orthogonal projection onto the eigenspace of A corresponding to the eigenvalue $a \in \{a_1, a_2\}$. The positive numbers p_1, p_2 have to obey $p_1 + p_2 = 1$. In order to correlate the measurement outcome a_i with the random state ρ_i as strongly as possible one has to search for an observable A which maximizes the probability

$$W^A(D) = \sum_{i=1}^{2} p_i \cdot \mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_i P^A_{a_i}\right) \tag{4}$$

of the 'detection event' $D = \{(\rho_1, a_1), (\rho_2, a_2)\}$.

Since the states ρ_1, ρ_2 are supposed to be pure, there exist unitvectors $\psi_i \in \mathcal{H}$ such that $\rho_i = \psi_i \langle \psi_i, \cdot \rangle$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Assume now tentatively that $\mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_i P^A_{a_j}\right) = 0$ for all pairs (i, j) with $i \neq j$. This implies $P^A_{a_i}\psi_j = 0$ for $i \neq j$ and therefore $A\psi_i = a_i\psi_i$ for all i. But this leads to $\langle \psi_1, \psi_2 \rangle = 0$ which contradicts the assumed non-orthogonality $\mathrm{tr}(\rho_1\rho_2) \neq 0$. Therefore the detection event D cannot be certain whatever choice of A is made. Rather Jaeger and Shimony have proven in [2] that the maximum of $W^A(D)$ obeys

$$\max_A \left\{W^A(D)\right\} = \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \sqrt{1 - 4p_1p_2 \cdot \cos^2\theta}\right) \tag{5}$$

with $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$ such that $\cos^2\theta = |\langle \psi_1, \psi_2 \rangle|^2 = \mathrm{tr}(\rho_1\rho_2)$. Here the maximum is taken over all linear, bounded and self-adjoint operators $A : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ whose spectrum consists of two fixed (unequal) eigenvalues a_1, a_2 only. It comes with little surprise that $\max_A \left\{W^A(D)\right\}$ does not depend on the choice of eigenvalues (a_1, a_2).

A related maximization problem is the following one. Find a linear, bounded and self-adjoint operator $A : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ such that firstly the spectrum of A consists of the eigenvalues $a_1 = a > 0, a_2 = -a$ and secondly A maximizes the weighted difference of expectation valus, i.e. $\Delta := p_1 \langle A \rangle_1 - p_2 \langle A \rangle_2$ with $\langle A \rangle_i = \mathrm{tr}(\rho_i A)$. Because of

$$\Delta = ap^A(\rho_1, a) + ap^A(\rho_2, -a) - ap^A(\rho_1, -a) - ap^A(\rho_2, a) \tag{6a}$$

$$= a \cdot \left(2W^A(D) - 1\right) \tag{6b}$$

this maximization problem for constant a is equivalent to the previous one of maximizing $W^A(D)$.

A genuinely alternative maximization problem is posed by the following one, which is known as *'unambiguous state discrimination'*. [3] Assume now that the spectrum of the observable A consists of three (different) eigenvalues a_0, a_1, a_2. Then the above probability space $\left(\Omega^A, W^A\right)$ is replaced by the event space $\Omega^A = \{\rho_1, \rho_2\} \times \{a_0, a_1, a_2\}$ with the modified probability measure W^A whose distribution function p^A obeys

$$p^A(\rho_i, a_j) = p_i \cdot \mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_i P^A_{a_j}\right). \tag{7}$$

If one now chooses A in such a way that

$$p^A(\rho_1, a_2) = 0 = p^A(\rho_2, a_1), \tag{8}$$

then, whenever the event $\{\rho_1, \rho_2\} \times \{a_i\}$ occurs, it follows that $\rho = \rho_i$. Thus, under these provisions, the state can be determined with certainty, whenever a measurement of A yields one of the values a_1 or a_2. Note that for $D = \{(\rho_1, a_1), (\rho_2, a_2)\}$ holds

$$W^A(D) = W^A(\{\rho_1, \rho_2\} \times \{a_1, a_2\}) = 1 - W^A(\{\rho_1, \rho_2\} \times \{a_0\}). \tag{9}$$

Yet, as above, the event $D = \{(\rho_1, a_1), (\rho_2, a_2)\}$, allowing for a correct state-identification, cannot be certain. Therefore one is led to search for those observables A, for which in addition to the validity of equation (8) the probability $W^A(D)$ is maximal.

Jaeger and Shimony [2] have proven for $\dim(\mathcal{H}) \geq 3$ that

$$\max_A \left\{W^A(D)\right\} = \begin{cases} 1 - 2\sqrt{p_1 p_2} \cdot \cos\theta & \text{for } \sqrt{\frac{\min\{p_1,p_2\}}{\max\{p_1,p_2\}}} \geq \cos\theta \\ \max\{p_1, p_2\} \sin^2\theta & \text{for } \sqrt{\frac{\min\{p_1,p_2\}}{\max\{p_1,p_2\}}} < \cos\theta \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

Here the maximization is performed over all those linear, bounded operators A, whose spectrum contains three different eigenvalues only, and which obey equation (8).

In this work we shall consider a third maximization problem. Among all linear, bounded and self-adjoint operators $A : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ we determine those which maximize the number δ_A given by equation (1) for two arbitrary but fixed non-orthogonal, non-identical, pure state density operators $\rho_1, \rho_2 : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$. Here

$$\Delta_\rho A = \sqrt{\langle A^2 \rangle_\rho - \langle A \rangle_\rho^2} \text{ with } \langle X \rangle_\rho = \mathrm{tr}(\rho X) \tag{11}$$

denotes the uncertainty of A in the state ρ. The number δ_A is invariant under the shift $A \to A + \mu \cdot \iota d_{\mathcal{H}}$ for any real μ and also under the rescaling $A \to \lambda A$ for any non-zero real λ. It relates the distance between the states' expectation values to their uncertainties and therefore has been proposed by Fleming [4] as a quantifier of the distinguishability of the states ρ_1 and ρ_2 by means of measuring A on a finite sample.

Part of our result is

$$\max_A \{\delta_A\} = \tan\theta, \tag{12}$$

where A is allowed to run through the set of all linear, bounded, self-adjoint operators $A : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$. Observe that no further restriction on the spectrum of A is imposed. In particular, the spectrum of A may include a continuous part.

Among the observables A maximizing δ_A we shall identify one which also maximizes $\langle A \rangle_{\rho_1} - \langle A \rangle_{\rho_2}$. It is given by¶ $A = (\rho_1 - \rho_2)/\sin\theta$. This operator therefore also maximizes the probability of correct state identification $W(D)$ for $p_1 = p_2 = 1/2$ from equation (5). Its value is given by

$$\max_A \left\{W^A(D)\right\} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \sin\theta). \tag{13}$$

¶ The spectum of A is $\{1, -1, 0\}$ if $\dim(\mathcal{H}) \geq 3$ and $\{1, -1\}$ if $\dim(\mathcal{H}) = 2$.

In deriving equation (12) we make use of a powerful estimate due to Fleming [4], that is conceived purely by general algebraic deliberations. Fleming called it a *' quantum master inequality'*, because he was able to derive a host of other well known quantum theoretical facts from it. Besides taking the orthogonality of two eigenvectors to different eigenvalues of an observable to a more general and quantitative level, Fleming's quantum master inequality also implies Robertson's generalized uncertainty relation $2\Delta A\Delta B \geq |\langle [A,B]\rangle|$. [5]

Fleming's quantum master inequality states that, whenever $\Delta_{\rho_1}A+\Delta_{\rho_2}A>0$, then $\delta_A \leq \tan\theta$. We shall first prove that Fleming's upper bound can be reached and then identify necessary and sufficient conditions on A for $\delta_A = \tan\theta$ to hold.

Before entering the problem of maximizing δ_A we will clarify the role of δ_A in identifying the state from an n-sample of states $\rho \in \{\rho_1, \rho_2\}$. We shall do so in the more general context of identifying a probability measure W on the real line within a set of two options $\{W_1, W_2\}$.

3. State identification for an n-sample

Let W denote a probability measure on the real line with finite expectation value $X := \mathbb{E}_W(\iota d_{\mathbb{R}})$ and variance $\Delta^2 := \mathbb{E}_W\left((\iota d_{\mathbb{R}} - X)^2\right)$. Chebyshev's inequality states that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ holds

$$W(\{x \in \mathbb{R} : |x - X| \geq t\}) \leq \left(\frac{\Delta}{t}\right)^2. \tag{14}$$

The product space $\mathbb{R}^n$ together with the product measure $W^n = W \times \ldots \times W$ corresponds to the random experiment of drawing n real numbers independently and each one distributed by W. The mean value of such a sample $(x_1, \ldots x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is given by the function $m_n : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ with

$$m_n(x_1, \ldots x_n) = \frac{1}{n}\sum\nolimits_{i=1}^{n} x_i. \tag{15}$$

For the expectation value and the variance of the random variable m_n under the measure W^n holds

$$\mathbb{E}_{W^n}(m_n) = X \text{ and } \mathbb{V}_{W^n}(m_n) = \frac{\Delta^2}{n}. \tag{16}$$

Application of Chebyshev's inequality to m_n thus yields the following law of large numbers

$$W^n(\{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n : |m_n(\omega) - X| \geq t\}) \leq \frac{1}{n}\cdot\left(\frac{\Delta}{t}\right)^2 \tag{17}$$

The probability that the mean value of a random sample $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of the distribution W^n deviates from the expectation value by at least a fixed value $t > 0$ converges to 0 when n goes to ∞.

Now, let W_1 and W_2 denote two different probabilty measures on the real line of the above type. Their expectation values X_i are assumed to be unequal and without

loss of generality we may assume $X_2 > X_1$. We also suppose that at least one of the probability measures W_i has non-zero variance, i.e. that $\Delta_1 + \Delta_2 > 0$.

A sample $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of n real numbers is supposed to be generated by either the distribution W_1^n or W_2^n. From the sample's mean value one may try to guess whether the sample has been generated by W_1^n or W_2^n. To this end, observe first that as a consequence of Chebyshev's inequality (17) we have for all $t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$

$$W_1^n\left(\{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n : m_n(\omega) \geq X_1 + t_1\}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n} \cdot \left(\frac{\Delta_1}{t_1}\right)^2, \tag{18a}$$

$$W_2^n\left(\{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n : m_n(\omega) \leq X_2 - t_2\}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n} \cdot \left(\frac{\Delta_2}{t_2}\right)^2. \tag{18b}$$

Choosing now the numbers t_i according to

$$t_i = \Delta_i \cdot \delta \text{ with } \delta = \frac{X_2 - X_1}{\Delta_1 + \Delta_2} > 0 \tag{19}$$

the estimates (18a) and (18b) turn into

$$W_1^n\left(\{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n : m_n(\omega) \geq X_0\}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)^2, \tag{20a}$$

$$W_2^n\left(\{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n : m_n(\omega) \leq X_0\}\right) \leq \frac{1}{n} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)^2. \tag{20b}$$

Here the point

$$X_0 = \frac{\Delta_2}{\Delta_1 + \Delta_2} X_1 + \frac{\Delta_1}{\Delta_1 + \Delta_2} X_2 \tag{21}$$

divides the interval $[X_1, X_2]$ into a portion of length $\frac{\Delta_1}{\Delta_1+\Delta_2} \cdot (X_2 - X_1)$ to the left of X_0 and another one of length $\frac{\Delta_2}{\Delta_1+\Delta_2} \cdot (X_2 - X_1)$ to the right of X_0. Observe that

$$X_1 + \frac{\Delta_1}{\Delta_1 + \Delta_2} \cdot (X_2 - X_1) = X_2 - \frac{\Delta_2}{\Delta_1 + \Delta_2} \cdot (X_2 - X_1) = X_0. \tag{22}$$

Let a sample $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be generated with probability $p_1 > 0$ through the measure W_1^n or with probability $p_2 = 1 - p_1 > 0$ through the measure W_2^n. This corresponds to the composite random trial with event space $\Omega = \{1, 2\} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ with the product measure W which obeys for all measurable $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^n$

$$W\left(\{i\} \times Z\right) = p_i \cdot W_i^n(Z). \tag{23}$$

Let E denote the event that the sample ω is either generated by W_2^n and yields a value $m_n(\omega) \leq X_0$ or is generated by W_1^n and has a mean value $m_n(\omega) \geq X_0$. Then this event's probability is bounded by

$$W(E) \leq p_1 \cdot \frac{1}{n} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)^2 + p_2 \cdot \frac{1}{n} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{n} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)^2. \tag{24}$$

Hence, by increasing n, this event's probability can be made arbitrarily small.

Thus we have the result: The event that ω is generated by W_1^n and has a mean value $m_n(\omega) \leq X_0$ or that ω is generated by W_2^n and has a mean value $m_n(\omega) \geq X_0$

has a probabilty greater or equal to $1-\frac{1}{n}\cdot\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)^2$. For $n\delta^2 > 1/\varepsilon \gg 1$ this implies that the event $m_n(\omega) \leq X_0$ is caused by W_1^n and $m_n(\omega) \geq X_0$ is caused by W_2^n has probability greater than $1-\varepsilon$ and so is virtually certain. This fact justifies the identification of a sample's generating distribution by means of the following criterion: if the sample's mean value obeys $m_n(\omega) < X_0$, then the sample ω is assumed to have been generated by W_1^n. If, however, $m_n(\omega) \geq X_0$, then the sample is assumed to have been gererated by W_2^n.

Besides the sample's size n the positiv real number

$$\delta = \frac{|X_1 - X_2|}{\Delta_1 + \Delta_2} \tag{25}$$

is decisive for the correct identification of the sample-generating distribution W_i^n from the sample's value $m_n(\omega)$ with high probability. The two distributions W_1^n and W_2^n are identified correctly with the higher a probability the larger the value of δ. One might call the parameter δ of two probability measures W_1 and W_2 on the real line their *discernability*.

As is well known, any pair (ρ, A) of a quantum state $\rho : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ and a bounded observable $A : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ defines a probability measure W_ρ^A on $\mathbb{R}$, which has its support on the spectrum of A. For any measurable set $Z \subset \mathbb{R}$ the number $W_\rho^A(Z)$ equals the probability that when A is measured on ρ the measured value belongs to Z. The expectation value and variance of $\iota d_{\mathbb{R}}$ under W_ρ^A equal $\mathrm{tr}(\rho A) = \langle A \rangle_\rho$ and $\mathrm{tr}(\rho A^2) - \mathrm{tr}(\rho A)^2 = (\Delta_\rho A)^2$. Thus the rule of identifying a probability measure $W \in \{W_1, W_2\}$ from an n-sample of measured values $(\omega_1, \ldots \omega_n)$ can be taken over in a straight-forward manner to the quantum case by replacing W_i with the probability measure $W_{\rho_i}^A$. Identification of W_i then amounts to an identification of ρ_i and the discernibility δ specializes to the expression given by equation (1).

4. Fleming's quantum master inequality

Let $\mathcal{H}$ denote a separable Hilbert space and let the linear mapping $A : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ be bounded and self-adjoint. The expectation value of A in the pure state represented by a unit vector $v \in \mathcal{H}$ is denoted as $\langle A \rangle_v$.[+] The following *quantum master inequality* (QMIE) relates two pure states through their first two moments of an observable. It has been given by Fleming in [4].

Proposition 1 *For any two unit vectors $v, w \in \mathcal{H}$ and any linear, bounded and self-adjoint operator $A : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ there holds*

$$|\langle A \rangle_w - \langle A \rangle_v| \cdot |\langle w, v \rangle| \leq (\Delta_v A + \Delta_w A) \cdot \sqrt{1 - |\langle w, v \rangle|^2}. \tag{26}$$

[+] Thus $\langle A \rangle_v = \langle v, Av \rangle$, and $\Delta_v A = \sqrt{\langle A^2 \rangle_v - \langle A \rangle_v^2}$ denotes the uncertainty of A in the state represented by v.

Before proving this estimate we discuss a few of its consequences. Observe first that there exists a unique $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$ such that $|\langle w, v\rangle| = \cos\theta$. Squaring the inequality (26) and slightly rearranging terms yields

$$\left[\left(\langle A\rangle_w - \langle A\rangle_v\right)^2 + \left(\Delta_v A + \Delta_w A\right)^2\right] \cos^2\theta \leq \left(\Delta_v A + \Delta_w A\right)^2. \tag{27}$$

Whenever the term in the square brackets is non-zero, then (26) is equivalent to

$$\cos^2\theta \leq \frac{\left(\Delta_v A + \Delta_w A\right)^2}{\left|\langle A\rangle_w - \langle A\rangle_v\right|^2 + \left(\Delta_v A + \Delta_w A\right)^2}. \tag{28}$$

For $\Delta_v A + \Delta_w A > 0$ inequality (28) is equivalent to

$$\cos^2\theta \leq \frac{1}{1+\delta^2} \text{ with } \delta = \frac{\left|\langle A\rangle_w - \langle A\rangle_v\right|}{\Delta_v A + \Delta_w A} \geq 0. \tag{29}$$

The bound (29) for $\cos^2\theta$ is strictly monotonically decreasing from 1 to 0 when δ moves from 0 to ∞. The number δ quantifies the distinguishability of the states represented by v and w through measuring A. For non-orthogonal vectors v and w the inequality (29) is equivalent to

$$\delta^2 \leq \frac{1}{\cos^2\theta} - 1 = \tan^2\theta. \tag{30}$$

Thus, for $\cos\theta > 0$ and $\Delta_v A + \Delta_w A > 0$ the estimate (26) is equivalent to

$$\delta \leq \tan\theta. \tag{31}$$

If v and w are parallel, then both sides of the inequality (26) take the value 0 due to $\langle A\rangle_w = \langle A\rangle_v$ and $|\langle w, v\rangle| = 1$. The inequality (26) is thus saturated in this case for any A. If v and w are orthogonal, the estimate (26) reduces to

$$0 \leq \Delta_v A + \Delta_w A. \tag{32}$$

This estimate is saturated if and only if $\Delta_v A = 0 = \Delta_w A$, which in turn holds if and only if both v and w are eigenvectors of A.

We shall now give a proof of Fleming's quantum master inequality (26).

Proof. In a first step we decompose the vector Av into a vector parallel to v and one orthogonal to v. This unique decomposition reads

$$Av = \langle A\rangle_v\, v + \left(Av - \langle A\rangle_v\, v\right), \tag{33}$$

since $\langle v, Av - \langle A\rangle_v\, v\rangle = 0$. Observe that the component $v_A = Av - \langle A\rangle_v\, v$ of Av orthogonal to v has the norm $\Delta_v A$ since

$$|v_A|^2 = \langle Av - \langle A\rangle_v\, v, Av - \langle A\rangle_v\, v\rangle = \left(\Delta_v A\right)^2. \tag{34}$$

We thus have

$$\langle w, Av\rangle = \langle A\rangle_v \langle w, v\rangle + \langle w, v_A\rangle. \tag{35}$$

The analogous decomposition of $Aw = \langle A\rangle_w\, w + w_A$ with $w_A = Aw - \langle A\rangle_w\, w$ yields

$$\langle Aw, v\rangle = \langle A\rangle_w \langle w, v\rangle + \langle w_A, v\rangle. \tag{36}$$

Since $\langle w, Av\rangle = \langle Aw, v\rangle$ we obtain

$$\left(\langle A\rangle_w - \langle A\rangle_v\right)\langle w, v\rangle = \langle w, v_A\rangle - \langle w_A, v\rangle\,. \tag{37}$$

Taking the absolute value from both sides and applying the triangle inequality on $\mathbb{C}$ gives the estimate

$$\left|\langle A\rangle_w - \langle A\rangle_v\right| \cdot \cos\theta = \left|\langle w, v_A\rangle - \langle w_A, v\rangle\right| \leq \left|\langle w, v_A\rangle\right| + \left|\langle w_A, v\rangle\right|, \tag{38}$$

where $\theta \in [0, \pi/2]$ is uniquely defined through $\cos\theta = \left|\langle w, v\rangle\right|$.

Since v_A is orthogonal to v, by means of the decomposition of w into a vector from $\mathbb{C}\cdot v$ and one from its orthogonal complement $(\mathbb{C}\cdot v)^{\perp}$ according to

$$w = \langle v, w\rangle\, v + \left(w - \langle v, w\rangle\, v\right), \tag{39}$$

we obtain the equality

$$\langle w, v_A\rangle = \langle w - \langle v, w\rangle\, v, v_A\rangle\,. \tag{40}$$

After taking the absolute value from both sides the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in $\mathcal{H}$ gives

$$\left|\langle w, v_A\rangle\right| = \left|\langle w - \langle v, w\rangle\, v, v_A\rangle\right| \leq \left|w - \langle v, w\rangle\, v\right|\left|v_A\right| = \sin\theta \cdot \Delta_v A. \tag{41}$$

Interchanging v and w leaves us with

$$\left|\langle w_A, v\rangle\right| = \left|\langle w_A, v - \langle w, v\rangle\, w\rangle\right| \leq \sin\theta \cdot \Delta_w A. \tag{42}$$

Inserting these bounds into the right-hand side of estimate (38) then leads to the statement of prop. 1,

$$\left|\langle A\rangle_w - \langle A\rangle_v\right| \cdot \cos\theta \leq \left(\Delta_v A + \Delta_w A\right) \cdot \sin\theta. \tag{43}$$

■

5. Conditions for saturating the QMIE

When $H = \hbar h$ denotes a Hamiltonian, the estimate (28) with $w = v_t := e^{-iht}v$ produces an upper bound for the survival probability $P_v(t) = \left|\langle v, v_t\rangle\right|^2$ of the initial state $v\,\langle v, \cdot\rangle$ under the time evolution up to time t, which is equivalent to

$$0 \leq Q(t) := \frac{\left(\Delta_v A + \Delta_{v_t} A\right)^2}{\left(\Delta_v A + \Delta_{v_t} A\right)^2 + \left|\langle A\rangle_{v_t} - \langle A\rangle_v\right|^2} - P_v(t)\,. \tag{44}$$

Searching for an observable A which minimizes $\int_0^T Q(t)\,dt$ for a period of time T of a spin-1/2-system, we have found the following necessary and sufficient conditions on A to saturate the QMIE. [6]

Proposition 2 *Let v, w be unit vectors in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with $\left|\langle w, v\rangle\right| = \cos\theta$ for some $\theta \in (0, \pi/2]$, i.e. v and w are assumed to be linearly independent. Let $A : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ be a linear, bounded and self-adjoint. Then, the QMIE for the states $\rho_1 = v\,\langle v, \cdot\rangle$ and $\rho_2 = w\,\langle w, \cdot\rangle$ is saturated, i.e, the equation*

$$\left|\langle A\rangle_w - \langle A\rangle_v\right| \cos\theta = \left(\Delta_v A + \Delta_w A\right) \sin\theta \tag{45}$$

holds, if and only if the conditions (i) and (ii) are fulfilled.

(i) The operator A leaves the subspace $\mathbb{C}\cdot v+\mathbb{C}\cdot w$ invariant.

(ii) The equation

$$\langle w, Av\rangle = \lambda \langle w, v\rangle \tag{46}$$

holds for some $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$ with

$$\min\left\{\langle A\rangle_w, \langle A\rangle_v\right\} \leq \lambda \leq \max\left\{\langle A\rangle_w, \langle A\rangle_v\right\}. \tag{47}$$

For $\theta = 0$ the QMIE is saturated for any observable A since both sides of the QMIE are zero. Thus, the proposition has to deal with the non-trivial case $0<\theta\leq\pi/2$ only.

Proof. The proof of proposition 1 contains three estimates. The first one is (38). It uses the triangle inequality for complex numbers as follows

$$|\langle w, v_A\rangle - \langle w_A, v\rangle| \leq |\langle w, v_A\rangle| + |\langle w_A, v\rangle|. \tag{48}$$

Here, equality holds if and only if the complex numbers $\langle w, v_A\rangle$ and $-\langle w_A, v\rangle$ as elements of $\mathbb{R}^2\simeq\mathbb{C}$ point into the same direction. This is the case if and only if there exists a pair $(\alpha,\beta)\in(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\times\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})\setminus(0,0)$ such that

$$\alpha\langle w, v_A\rangle + \beta\langle w_A, v\rangle = 0. \tag{49}$$

The other two estimates are contained in (41) and (42). They employ the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for the scalar product of two elements of $\mathcal{H}$. The estimate (41) thus is saturated if and only if the vector v_A is a (complex) multiple of the (non-zero)* vector $w-\langle v, w\rangle v$, i.e., if

$$v_A \in \mathbb{C}\cdot(w-\langle v, w\rangle v). \tag{50}$$

Similarly, the estimate (42) is saturated if and only if

$$w_A \in \mathbb{C}\cdot(v-\langle w, v\rangle w). \tag{51}$$

Therefore, the equality (45) holds if and only if all three conditions (49), (50), and (51) are fullfilled. The conditions (50), and (51) hold, if and only if A maps the space which is spanned by v and w onto itself. This can be seen as follows: (50) implies♯ that $Av\in\mathbb{C}\cdot v+\mathbb{C}\cdot w$ and (51) implies that $Aw\in\mathbb{C}\cdot v+\mathbb{C}\cdot w$. On the other hand, since v_A is by definition orthogonal to v and w_A is orthogonal to w, the conditions (50) and (51) follow from $A(\mathbb{C}\cdot v+\mathbb{C}\cdot w)\subset(\mathbb{C}\cdot v+\mathbb{C}\cdot w)$.

We now have to address condition (49). This condition says that there exists a pair $(\alpha,\beta)\in(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\times\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})\setminus(0,0)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \alpha\langle w, Av-\langle A\rangle_v v\rangle + \beta\langle Aw-\langle A\rangle_w w, v\rangle && (52a)\\ &= \alpha\langle w, Av\rangle + \beta\langle Aw, v\rangle - \alpha\langle A\rangle_v\langle w, v\rangle - \beta\langle A\rangle_w\langle w, v\rangle && (52b)\\ &= (\alpha+\beta)\langle w, Av\rangle - (\alpha\langle A\rangle_v + \beta\langle A\rangle_w)\langle w, v\rangle. && (52c)\end{aligned}$$

* Due to $\theta>0$ we have $w-\langle v, w\rangle v\neq 0\neq v-\langle w, v\rangle w$.

♯ Observe that it is here that we need that v and w are linearly independent, i.e. that $\theta>0$. In case of $\theta=0$ a condition on v_A does not follow from saturating estimate (41).

Since $\alpha+\beta>0$, it follows that condition (49) holds if and only if there exists a pair $(\alpha,\beta)\in(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\times\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})\setminus(0,0)$ such that

$$\langle w,Av\rangle=\left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}\langle A\rangle_v+\frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta}\langle A\rangle_w\right)\langle w,v\rangle\,. \tag{53}$$

Due to $\left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta},\frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta}\right)\in([0,1]\times[0,1])\setminus(0,0)$, and $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}+\frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta}=1$, the real number

$$\lambda=\left(\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}\langle A\rangle_v+\frac{\beta}{\alpha+\beta}\langle A\rangle_w\right) \tag{54}$$

is a convex combination of $\langle A\rangle_v$ and $\langle A\rangle_w$. Thus condition (49) holds if and only if $\langle w,Av\rangle$ is a real multiple of $\langle w,v\rangle$, where the factor belongs to the interval bounded by $\langle A\rangle_v$ and $\langle A\rangle_w$. Thus we have proven equation (46). ■

Observe that in case of $\cos\theta=0$ the pair (v,w) is an orthonormal basis of the space $\mathbb{C}\cdot v+\mathbb{C}\cdot w$. Then, the equation (45) holds if and only if A stabilizes the subspace $\mathbb{C}\cdot v+\mathbb{C}\cdot w$ and $\langle w,Av\rangle=0$. This in turn is equivalent to the statement that v and w both are eigenvectors of A, because of $Av=\langle v,Av\rangle\,v+\langle w,Av\rangle\,w=\langle A\rangle_v\,v$ and similarly $Aw=\langle A\rangle_w\,w$. If on the other hand for $0<\theta<\pi/2$ we have $\Delta_vA+\Delta_wA=0$ it follows that $\langle A\rangle_w=\langle A\rangle_v$ and that v and w are eigenvectors of A with the same eigenvalue.

Thus the nontrivial case of equation (45) is realized if $0<\theta<\pi/2$ and $\Delta_vA+\Delta_wA>0$ is valid. In this case the equality $\delta_A=\tan\theta$ holds if and only if the conditions (i) and (ii) are fulfilled.

6. Observables of maximal δ_A

We shall now determine the set of observables A which for given states $\rho_1=v\,\langle v,\cdot\rangle$, and $\rho_2=w\,\langle w,\cdot\rangle$ obey $\Delta_wA+\Delta_vA>0$ and $\delta_A=\tan\theta$. Let $v,w\in\mathcal{H}$ be unit vectors with $0<|\langle v,w\rangle|<1$ and let $A:\mathcal{H}\to\mathcal{H}$ be linear, bounded and self-adjoint. Without loss of generality we assume that $\langle A\rangle_v\leq\langle A\rangle_w$ and that $|\langle v,w\rangle|=\langle v,w\rangle$. According to prop. 2 the equation $\delta_A=\tan\theta$ holds if and only if

(i) A stabilizes $\mathbb{C}\cdot v+\mathbb{C}\cdot w$

(ii) The quotient $\frac{\langle w,Av\rangle}{\langle w,v\rangle}$ is real and obeys $\langle A\rangle_v\leq\frac{\langle w,Av\rangle}{\langle w,v\rangle}\leq\langle A\rangle_w$.

Since A is self-adjoint, condition (i) implies that A stabilizes the orthogonal complement of $\mathbb{C}\cdot v+\mathbb{C}\cdot w$ too. Therefore, the action of A on this complementary subspace $[\mathbb{C}\cdot v+\mathbb{C}\cdot w]^{\perp}$ has no relevance to our problem and it is the restriction A_0 of A to $\mathcal{H}_0:=\mathbb{C}\cdot v+\mathbb{C}\cdot w$ only which has to be studied.

Since $\delta_{\lambda A+\mu\iota d_{\mathcal{H}}}=\delta_A$ holds for all $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}\setminus 0$ and $\mu\in\mathbb{R}$ and for all A with $\Delta_wA+\Delta_vA>0$, we may use this freedom of shifting and rescaling A in such a way that the spectrum of A_0 obeys $\sigma(A_0)=\{1,-1\}$. This is clearly equivalent to

$$\mathrm{tr}\,(A_0)=0 \text{ and } det\,(A_0)=-1. \tag{55}$$

Observe that, because of $0<\Delta_wA+\Delta_vA=\Delta_wA_0+\Delta_vA_0$, a transformation into $A_0=\iota d_{\mathcal{H}_0}$ is impossible.

Among the observables $A_0 : \mathcal{H}_0 \to \mathcal{H}_0$ wich obey (55) we now search for those which satisfy

$$\langle A_0 \rangle_v \leq \frac{\langle w, A_0 v \rangle}{\langle w, v \rangle} \leq \langle A_0 \rangle_w . \tag{56}$$

To do so we introduce the following orthonormal basis in $\mathcal{H}_0$:

$$e_1 = \frac{v+w}{2\cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)}, \quad e_2 = \frac{w-v}{2\sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)}. \tag{57}$$

The vectors v and w thus have the decomposition

$$w = \cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \cdot e_1 + \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \cdot e_2 \text{ and } v = \cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \cdot e_1 - \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \cdot e_2. \tag{58}$$

The matrix elements of A_0 with respect to $\underline{e} = (e_1, e_2)$ are denoted as $A_{ij} = \langle e_i, A_0 e_j \rangle$. Clearly, $A_{ii} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $A_{12} \in \mathbb{C}$ with $A_{21} = \overline{A_{12}}$. Condition (55) is equivalent to

$$A_{11} = -A_{22} \text{ and } A_{11}^2 + |A_{12}|^2 = 1. \tag{59}$$

For the matrix elements involved in (56) we find

$$\langle v, Av \rangle = \cos(\theta) A_{11} - \sin(\theta) \Re(A_{12}), \tag{60a}$$

$$\langle w, Av \rangle = A_{11} - i \sin(\theta) \Im(A_{12}), \tag{60b}$$

$$\langle w, Aw \rangle = \cos(\theta) A_{11} + \sin(\theta) \Re(A_{12}). \tag{60c}$$

Condition (56) therefore implies that

$$\Im(A_{12}) = 0 \text{ and } \Re(A_{12}) \geq 0.$$

Due to $A_{11}^2 + A_{12}^2 = 1$ there exists a unique $\alpha \in [0, \pi]$ with

$$A_{11} = \cos\alpha \text{ and } A_{12} = \sin\alpha.$$

Using this parametrization the matrix elements of A_0 obey

$$\langle v, Av \rangle = \cos(\theta + \alpha), \tag{61a}$$

$$\langle w, Av \rangle = \cos\alpha, \tag{61b}$$

$$\langle w, Aw \rangle = \cos(\theta - \alpha) \tag{61c}$$

Condition (56) thus implies

$$\cos(\theta)\cos(\theta+\alpha) \leq \cos\alpha \leq \cos(\theta)\cos(\theta-\alpha). \tag{62}$$

which, due to $\cos(\theta)\cos(\theta+\alpha) = [\cos(\alpha) + \cos(2\theta+\alpha)]/2$, is equivalent to

$$\cos(2\theta+\alpha) \leq \cos\alpha \leq \cos(2\theta-\alpha). \tag{63}$$

On the domain $(\theta, \alpha) \in (0, \pi/2) \times [0, \pi]$ condition (63) is equivalent to

$$\theta \leq \alpha \leq \pi - \theta. \tag{64}$$

Finally, it is now easy to prove that for any linear, bounded and self-adjoint map $A : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ which stabilizes $\mathcal{H}_0$ and whose restriction A_0 to $\mathcal{H}_0$ obeys

$$A_0 = \cos(\alpha)\left[e_1 \langle e_1, \cdot\rangle - e_2 \langle e_2, \cdot\rangle\right] + \sin(\alpha)\left[e_1 \langle e_2, \cdot\rangle + e_2 \langle e_1, \cdot\rangle\right] \tag{65}$$

for some $\alpha \in [\theta, \pi - \theta]$ there holds $\delta_A = \tan\theta$. To do so we first derive from (61*a*) and (61*c*)

$$\langle w, Aw\rangle - \langle v, Av\rangle = 2\sin(\theta)\sin(\alpha) \tag{66}$$

and then observe that

$$(\Delta_v A)^2 = 1 - \langle A\rangle_v^2 = \sin^2(\theta + \alpha), \tag{67}$$

$$(\Delta_w A)^2 = 1 - \langle A\rangle_w^2 = \sin^2(\theta - \alpha). \tag{68}$$

From this it follows that

$$\delta_A = \frac{\langle w, Aw\rangle - \langle v, Av\rangle}{\Delta_w A + \Delta_v A} = \frac{2\sin(\theta)\sin(\alpha)}{\sqrt{\sin^2(\theta-\alpha)} + \sqrt{\sin^2(\theta+\alpha)}}. \tag{69}$$

Since $0 \leq \alpha - \theta \leq \pi$ and $0 < \theta + \alpha \leq \pi$ we have

$$\sqrt{\sin^2(\theta-\alpha)} = \sin(\alpha - \theta) \text{ and } \sqrt{\sin^2(\theta+\alpha)} = \sin(\alpha+\theta) \tag{70}$$

and therefore

$$\delta_A = \frac{2\sin(\theta)\sin(\alpha)}{2\sin(\alpha)\cos(\theta)} = \tan(\theta). \tag{71}$$

We may now summarize our result as follows.

Proposition 3 *Let v, w be unit vectors in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with $\langle v, w\rangle = \cos\theta$ for some $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$. A linear, bounded self-adjoint operator $A : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ with $\Delta_w A + \Delta_v A > 0$ reaches Fleming's bound, i.e. obeys*

$$\delta_A := \frac{|\langle A\rangle_w - \langle A\rangle_v|}{\Delta_w A + \Delta_v A} = \tan\theta, \tag{72}$$

if and only if

(i) A stabilizes the subspace $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathbb{C}\cdot v + \mathbb{C}\cdot w \subset \mathcal{H}$ and

(ii) the restriction of A to $\mathcal{H}_0$ is related to an operator A_0 from the set

$$\{\cos(\alpha)(E_{11} - E_{22}) + \sin(\alpha)(E_{12} + E_{21}) \,|\, \alpha \in [\theta, \pi - \theta]\} \tag{73}$$

through $A|_{\mathcal{H}_0} = \lambda A_0 + \mu id_{\mathcal{H}_0}$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}\setminus 0$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$. Here $E_{ij} := e_i\langle e_j, \cdot\rangle$, with the vectors e_i from equation (57).

Observe from equation (66) that for $\alpha = \pi/2$ the expectation values' difference $\langle A\rangle_w - \langle A\rangle_v$ is maximal. The maximal difference has the value $2\sin\theta$. From equation (6*b*) we then obtain for $p_1 = p_2 = 1/2$ that

$$\sin\theta = 2W^A(D) - 1. \tag{74}$$

Thus we have $W^A(D) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \sin\theta)$, which coincides with the result of Jaeger and Shimony [2] stated in equation (5). The corresponding observable A_0 has the following particularly simple form

$$A_0 = e_1\langle e_2, \cdot\rangle + e_2\langle e_1, \cdot\rangle = \frac{w\langle w, \cdot\rangle - v\langle v, \cdot\rangle}{\sin\theta}. \tag{75}$$

Acknowledgments

We thank Florian Fröwis and Markus Penz for several stimulating discussions.

References

[1] A Chefles, *Quantum state discrimination,* Contemp Phys **41** (2000) 401 - 24

[2] G Jaeger, A Shimony, *Optimal distinction between two non-orthogonal quantum states,* Phys Lett **A 197** (1995) 83-7

[3] S Barnett, *Quantum limited state discrimination,* Fortschr Phys **49** (2001) 909-13

[4] G N Fleming, *Uses of a quantum master inequality,* Arxiv preprint physics/0106077, 2001 - arxiv.org

[5] G N Fleming, *Correlation coefficients and Robertson-Schrödinger uncertainty relations,* qaunt-ph/0703226v1, march 2007

[6] L Ostermann, *Fleming's quantum-master-inequality in spin-1/2-systems,* Diplomarbeit Universität Innsbruck, 2010